THANK you, Oh SEN, who known not only when to forget but for precisely how long! And who can, as the record shows, anticipate the time in t ansit, yeah, even today. If neither George does anything, the timing could not have been more perfect. McG went into today's Parade/Martha's letter story. If your papers do not have Parade, I have it filed under The Liberating Woman. Ask. Now when I skip, please go to the bottom. I taped this past of Issues and Answers on a cassette which begins with Today's show on it. I'll send. Note the White House, which refuses to debate,

Route 8, Frederick, Md. 21701
301/473-8196
10/22/72

Dear George Cunningham,

I think it is perhaps possible for the Senator to go farther than he did in his effective appearance on Issues and Answers today when the question of Martha/Mitchell come up.

The enclosed copy of a clipping from the San Francisco Examiner of June 15, 1972, illustrates my point. The UPI wire copy may have been longer than is here printed.

Here, two days before the Watergate Arrests, Mrs. Mitchell is "back on the political firing line again" and apparently quite happy about it, "She is very much caught up in the political campaign and says when it is all over "I am going to rock and remark".

Did politics become such a "dirty business" from which her husband had to get out immediately or lose her in just two days? I think not. What may have been so dirty was getting caught.

I am in accord with the Senator's analysis that it is not John who liberated Martha but John who used Martha in an effort to liberate John. It has been my own analysis from the first. I am not alone. I know several reporters who have long held the same view.

The Senator made one factual error common in all of the press, and some know better. It is not "two former White House aides" who were in on this rotten business. The Senator was taken in by Clawson's deceptive announcement, that Hunt's last day had been March 29. Were this true, he would still have been in on it. But it is false. Hunt continued working for Colson et al at the White House until after the arrests, when he was severed. I filed a request with Clawson for the days of Hunt's White House employment subsequent to 3/29/72 and for the government contracts of the Mullen agency. Under date of 10/19 I received a reply from Presidential Counsel Dean saying this information was part of an investigatory file hence exempt, which is false in both respects, it is not part of an investigatory file as defined by the law and in any event not exempt. I have filed an appeal, about which nothing will be done until after the election, if at all.

Hunt was a White House employee at the time of the arrests. And for several days thereafter. Incriminating evidence was found in his desk after the arrests. It was not first searched by the FBI, either. I mean his White House desk. I have the news reports on this. So on this basis alone the White House and the President were directly involved because a current employee was involved and indicted. He was indicted for a crime he committed while working for the White House. He was working for the White House when he was on the scene of the crime and just missed being arrested in the act. Liddy has been shipped to join the other Creeps, not Hunt. I believe the distinction is very important. You don't have to take my word for this. I will supply the contemporaneous accounts or I am sure Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward of the Post will tell you the White House has refused to give them the exact dates of Hunt's post-March 29 employment. Among the obvious reasons are his trip to Miami that just coincides with the developing of the film of Larry O'Brien's stolen files, developing done in Miami.

Hunt's other payroll of the period was the Mullen agency, which did have government contracts, and Hunt was allegedly working on one involving the President's daughter. That Dean totally ignored my request for the Mullen contracts under the Freedom of Information law cannot be a simple oversight, not for the Counsel to the President, the man who made that so-called "investigation" of this matter for the President, that "investigation" of which we have hear so often and with such piety and protestation of purity, as recently as yesterday by Mr. Agnew who given this "investigation" as one of the reasons for having no moral or ethical twinges. (Of course, he doesn't twinge easily, and he has the benefit of a special dictionary, special morals and special ethics.)

---

still presumes to ask the show to ask McG questions (loaded, leading questions). I didn't see Harris on Meet the Press but understand he said this issue is now taking hold.
So did somebody else, without a poll!

Harold Weisberg